

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 24, 2004, and in accordance with the telephone interview courteously granted by the Examiner on August 17, 2004. Claims 1, 10, 18, 29, 45, 46, 47, 49 and 52 have been amended. The claims have been amended for clarity. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments made herein. New Claims 55 to 70 have been added. A Terminal Disclaimer is submitted herein. A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time to respond to the Office Action is submitted herewith. A check in the amount of \$574.00 is submitted herein to cover the cost of the one-month extension and the new claims. A check in the amount of \$110.00 is enclosed to cover the cost of the Terminal Disclaimer. Please charge deposit account 02-1818 for any insufficiency or to credit any overpayment.

Claims 46 to 54 were objected to based on the numbering of the claims. The Claims have been amended to overcome these rejections. Please note that duplicate Claim 46 has been changed to new Claim 70.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 38 and 49 to 54 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 to 62 of U.S. Patent No. 6,695,696. Applicant is submitting a Terminal Disclaimer with this response as indicated above to overcome these rejections. Accordingly, these rejections of Claims 1 to 38 and 49 to 54 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 to 7, 9 to 16, 18 to 25, 29 to 36 and 49 to 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Application No. 0558307-A2 to Thomas ("*Thomas*"). Claims 39 to 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,159,095 to Frohm et al. ("*Frohm*"). Claims 8, 17, 27, 28, 37, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas. Claims 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Frohm*. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thomas* in view of *Frohm*. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses these rejections for the following reasons. Additionally, Applicant has amended certain of these claims to clarify the meaning of the elements in the Claims.

Claims 1 to 7, 9 to 16, 18 to 25, 29 to 36 and 49 to 54 were rejected under section 102(b) as being anticipated by *Thomas*. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Additionally, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the claim language such that the display replicates or displays an image of at least one of the symbol generators such as a reel in each play of the game where the symbols generated and displayed by the symbol generator or reel in each play of the game is displayed regardless of the symbols generated and displayed by the symbol generators or reels in any previous plays of the game as discussed during the telephone interview conducted on August 17, 2004.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a gaming device operated under the control of at least one processor where the gaming devices includes a cabinet, a game operable upon a wager made by a player and a plurality of reels controlled by the processor in the game where the reels are mounted in the cabinet. The gaming device also includes a plurality of symbols on each of the reels and a video display controlled by the processor which is mounted to the cabinet. When the reels are activated and spin in each play of the game, the video display displays at least one image of each of the reels spinning and then images of the symbols which are generated and displayed on each of the reels after the reels stop spinning, regardless of the symbols generated and displayed on each of the reels in any previous plays of the game.

As discussed during the telephone interview conducted on August 17, 2004, *Thomas* does not disclose, teach or suggest activating and spinning a plurality of reels in each play of the game, a video display which displays at least one image of each of the reels spinning and images of the symbols generated and displayed by each of the reels after the reel stop spinning in each of those plays of the game, regardless of the symbols generated and displayed on each of the reels in any previous plays of the game. Additionally, in the interview summary dated August 23, 2004, the Examiner stated that "Thomas appears to differ from the Applicants invention because Thomas does not always display the same information on its two sets of reels." (See, the Interview Summary, page 3). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *Thomas*

does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention for at least the following reasons.

Thomas is directed to a gaming machine including a set of electro-mechanical reels 4, 6 and 8 and a plurality of simulated reels 22, 24, and 26 which correspond to the mechanical reels. (Col. 4, lines 20 to 35). Initially, each simulated reel is aligned with its corresponding electro-mechanical reel. A player then initiates the spinning of all of the reels 4, 6, 8, 22, 24 and 26. (Col. 4, lines 51 to 58). *Thomas* states that “each simulated reel may spin in synchronism and by the same amount as its associated electro-mechanical reel, but preferably they spin independently so that they may rotate by different amounts.” (Col. 4, line 56 to Col. 5, line 1). If no winning combinations are aligned on either of the win lines associated with the electro-mechanical or simulated reels, the symbols on the win line associated with the simulated reels are changed to correspond to the symbols on the electro-mechanical reels aligned on the win line 32. As a result, the simulated reels 22, 24, and 26 include symbols which are slightly different from the symbols on the corresponding electro-mechanical reels 4, 6, and 8. (Col. 5, lines 25 to 30). Accordingly as stated by *Thomas*, the difference between the symbols on the win lines associated with the simulated reels and electro-mechanical reels increases the likelihood that particular combinations of symbols appearing on the win line 34 after the reels have stopped will be different. *Thomas* further states that “eventually the sequences of symbols on the simulated reels may be very different from the sequences on the mechanical reels.” (Emphasis added)(Col. 5, line 36 to 40). Therefore, *Thomas* does not disclose, teach or suggest that the simulated reels 22, 24, and 26 correspond, display or replicate the electro-mechanical reels 4, 6 and 8 and more specifically, replicate the symbols on electro-mechanical reels in each play of the game regardless of the symbols generated and displayed in any previous plays of the game.

For at least these reasons, amended Claim 1 and Claims 2 to 9, which depend from amended Claim 1, are each patentably distinguished over *Thomas* and are in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 10 is directed to a gaming device including a cabinet, a game operable upon a wagering made by a player, a plurality of symbol generated devices mounted to the cabinet in the game where each of the symbol generated devices are adapted to generate a plurality of symbols and a separate display device mounted to the cabinet where the display device is adapted to replicate each of the symbol generating device. The gaming device also includes a processor which operable in each play of the game to cause each of the symbol generating devices to move, generate at least one symbol on each symbol generating device, causes the display device to display a replication of a movement of at least one of the symbol generating devices, and cause the display device to display a replication of the symbols generated by each of the symbol generated devices, regardless of the symbols generated by each of the symbol generating devices in any previous plays of any game.

As described above, *Thomas* does not disclose, teach or suggest displaying an image of a symbol generating device or reel or a replication of the symbol generating device or reel on a separate display device in each play of a game. Additionally, *Thomas* does not disclose, teach or suggest replicating the symbols of a symbol generating device on a separate display device where the replication of the symbols is preformed regardless of the symbols generated by each of the symbol generating devices in any previous plays of the game.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided above with respect to amended Claim 1, amended Claim 10 and Claims 11 to 17, which depend from amended Claim 10, are each patentably distinguished over *Thomas* and are in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 18 is directed to a method of operating a gaming device including a game operable upon a wager by a player where the method includes the steps of displaying a plurality of reels including a plurality of symbols where the reels are mounted to a cabinet of the gaming device and spinning the reels in each play of the game. The method includes displaying at least one image of each of the reels spinning on a separate video display mounted to the cabinet of the gaming device and stop the reels to display at least one symbol on each of the reels in each play of the game. The method includes displaying images of the symbols displayed on each of the

reels on the video display in each play of the game regardless of the displayed symbols on each of the reels in any previous plays of the game.

As described above, *Thomas* does not disclose, teach or suggest displaying at least one image of each of the reels spinning on a separate video display in each play of a game. *Thomas* also does not disclose, teach or suggest displaying images of the symbols displayed on each of the reels on the video display in each play of the game regardless of the displayed symbols on each of the reels in any previous plays of the game. Therefore, amended Claim 18 and Claims 19 to 28, which depend from amended Claim 18, are each patentably distinguished over *Thomas* and in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 29 is directed to a method operating a gaming device including a game operable upon a wager made by a player where the method includes the steps of displaying a plurality of symbol generating devices mounted to a cabinet of the gaming device in a game and displaying a replication of each of the symbol generating devices on a separate display device mounted to the cabinet of the gaming device in each play of the game. The method include moving the symbol generating devices in each play of the game and generating at least one symbol on each of the symbol generating devices in each play of the game. The method also includes displaying a replication of the movement of the symbol generating devices and a replication of at least one symbol generated by each of the symbol generating devices on the separate display device in each play of the game regardless of the symbols generated by each of the symbol generating devices in any previous plays of the game.

As described above, *Thomas* does disclose, teach or suggest the elements of amended Claim 29. Specifically, *Thomas* does not disclose, teach or suggest displaying a replication of each of the symbol generating devices on a separate display device in each play of a game regardless of the symbol generated by each of the symbol generating devices in any previous plays of the game. For at least these reasons, amended Claim 29 and Clams 30 to 38, which depend from amended Claim 29, are each patentably distinguished over *Thomas* and are in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 49 is directed to a gaming devices including a cabinet, a game operable upon wager made by a player and at least one symbol generating device mounted to the cabinet in the game where each of the symbol generating devices are adapted to generate a plurality of symbols. The gaming devices also includes a separate display devices mounted to the cabinet where the display is adapted to replicate each of the symbol generating devices. The gaming device includes a processor which in each play of the game, is operable to cause a sequential indication of each of the plurality of different symbols of each of the symbol generating devices, indicate at least generated symbol of each the symbol generating devices, causes a display device to display replication of the sequential indications of the different symbols of each of the symbol generating devices, and causes the display device to display replication of the symbol generated and indicated by each of the symbol generating devices, regardless of any of the symbols generated and indicated by each of the symbol generating devices in any previous plays of the game. As described above, *Thomas* does not disclose, teach or suggest such elements. Therefore, amended Claim 49 and Claims 50 to 51, which depend from amended Claim 49 are patentably distinguished over *Thomas* and in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 52 is directed to a method of operating a gaming device including a game operable upon a wager made by a player where the method includes displaying at least one symbol generating devices mounted to a cabinet of the gaming device and displaying a replication of each of the symbol generating devices on a separate display devices mounted to the cabinet of the gaming devices. The method includes causing a sequential indication of a plurality of different symbols of each of the symbol generating device in each play of the game. The method also includes generating at least one symbol on each on the symbol generating device in each play of the game and displaying replication of the sequential indication of the plurality of symbols of each of the symbol generating devices in a replication of at least one symbol generated by each of the symbol generating devices on the separate display device in each play of the game, regardless of the symbols generated by each of the symbol generating devices in any previous plays of the game. As described above, *Thomas*

does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of amended Claim 52. Therefore, amended Claim 52 and Claims 53 to 54 which depend from amended Claim 52, are each patentably distinguished over *Thomas* and in condition for allowance.

Claims 39 to 46 were rejected under section 102(e) as being anticipated by *Frohm*. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection for the following reasons.

Amended Claim 39 is directed to a gaming device including a cabinet, a display device mounted to the cabinet, and a plurality of symbol generating devices displayed to a first area of the display device where each of the symbol generating devices are adapted to generate at least symbol. The gaming device also includes a plurality of separate paylines associates with the symbol generating devices and a separate pay chart adapted to be displayed in a second different area of the display device. For each of the plurality paylines, the pay chart is adapted to display an identification of the payline and an indication of any award value resulting from the symbols generated by the symbol generating devices after the generation of the symbols and indicated on the payline. *Frohm* does not disclose, teach or suggest these elements.

Frohm is directed to a video gaming device having multiple stacking features. The gaming device includes a plurality of game boards 20 where each game board 20 includes a phase 22 that displays cards 24 of the single hand of a five card poker game. (Col. 3, lines 47 to 56). The pop-up individual game board 20 having winning game outcomes. Any winning game boards 99 pop-up or displayed to player. A payable 100 displays winning game outcomes. A payable 100 identifies the amount of coins or credits awarded for varies outcomes of symbols in a game. (Col. 5, lines 66 to Col. 6, line 5). Therefore, *Frohm* does not disclose, teach or suggest a separate pay chart adapted to display in a different area of a display device or for each of the plurality of paylines, a pay chart adapted to display an identification of the payline and an indication of any award value resulting from the symbols generated by the symbol generating devices after the generation of symbols are indicated on the payline. Instead, *Frohm* describes game boards which display winning outcomes on the individual game boards but not on a separate pay chart displaying the separate outcomes or awards associated with all of the game boards. Therefore, Claim 39 and Claims 40 to 43, which depend

from Claim 39, are each patentably distinguished over *Frohm* and are in condition for allowance.

Claim 44 is directed to a method of operating a gaming device including similar elements to Claim 39. Therefore for at least the reasons provided above with respect to Claim 39, Claim 44 and Claims 45 to 48, which depend from Claim 44, are each patentable distinguished over *Frohm* and in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that new Claim 55 and new Claims 56 to 61, which depend from new Claim 55, are each patentably distinguished over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. It is also respectfully submitted that new Claim 62 and new Claims 63 to 71, which depend from new Claim 62, are each patentably distinguished over the cited references and are in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and, in the absence of more pertinent art, such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY: 

Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
P. O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4284

Dated: October 19, 2004